

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending in this application. All claims remain rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Okigami in view of Antziopulos. For the reasons stated herein, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration of the claims as presented in their response of February 28, 2005. Moreover, applicants must express their disappointment at the Examiner's failure to carefully and accurately consider the remarks accompanying the amendment of February 28, 2005.

For example, in the response of February 28, 2005, applicants noted a significant difference between pending claims 1 and 8 and the cited prior art. As recited in claims 1 and 8, the present system requires that the "controller of said terminal apparatus updates, based on said identification information and said operation value of each part transmitted from said management apparatus, the corresponding operation value of said identification information stored in said first memory." (emphasis added) This feature is not taught, described, or suggested by Antziopoulos, Okigami or any other reference, and the Examiner has failed to identify this feature in the prior art.

The Examiner's response to this argument was that the "Examiner asserts that monitors must update a controller at some point. Otherwise, why install them." The reasons for installing monitors, however, are numerous and there is no aspect of a "monitor" that inherently updates another component of a system. Thus the Examiner is required to evaluate this element of the claims and its associated limitations. More importantly, the Examiner's unsupported assertion fails to address the relevant element of the claims. Specifically, that the "controller of said terminal apparatus updates, based on said identification information and said operation value of each part transmitted from said management apparatus, the corresponding operation value of said

The present claims define an invention in which information is transmitted from the terminal apparatus to the management apparatus to identify each replacement part and the total usage of each part. The management apparatus uses this information to determine how long the identified part has been in operation over its lifetime. The Examiner is respectfully requested to understand that the invention as recited in claims 1 and 8 teaches a system that allows a part to be removed from a malfunctioning copier system and used as a replacement part in a functioning system. The management apparatus is then able to accurately determine how much life remains in the replacement part, despite it having been previously installed in another copier. Neither cited reference, when taken alone or in combination, teach this feature. For these reasons, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) over Okigami in view of Antziopoulos must be withdrawn.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.

325772019400.

Dated: August 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Wayne C. Jaeschke, Jr.

Registration No.: 38,503

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7756

identification information stored in said first memory.” Nowhere does the reference teach that the controller is updated on the basis defined in the pending claims.

As well, the Examiner has completely misapprehended applicant’s remarks and relevant claims terms. In the Response to Arguments (para. 2 of the Action of May 19, 2005) the Examiner states “Applicant asserts that there is no teaching for a removing a component from the copier. The examiner cannot find the removing step in the claim language.” This clearly evidences the Examiner’s failure to give thoughtful consideration to applicants’ remarks.

Applicants have explained that Antziopoulos does not provide for the situation where a replacement part may be used in more than one copier. The presently claimed invention stores the usage of part in the manner that permits the life of a part to be determined regardless of whether it is moved between copy machines. As applicants previously remarked, Antziopoulos’ system is directed toward the situation where replacement components are installed by a user or technician that have a usable life that cannot be determined by the central memory of the copier system. Since the central memory of the copier system doesn’t know the usable life of a component, the system would be unable to determine when a component is due for replacement.

To overcome this, Antziopoulos suggests the use of a magnetic data card that is inserted into the machine to active it once a component is installed. The data card would include information about the usable life of the component. In contrast, the system and method of the present invention permit the usage information of a part to be monitored continuously and is independent from the apparatus in which the part may be presently installed. In order to disclose this feature of the invention, Antziopoulos would have to teach a method or system for 1) removing a component from a copier; 2) writing data onto a card; and 3) reinstalling that component in another apparatus. Antziopoulos does not include such a teaching.